

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 1, 2008, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-12 and 17 are rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over French (U.S. Patent No. 5,651,548, hereinafter "French") in view of Vuong et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0147042 A1, hereinafter "Vuong") and Walker (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0123376 A1, hereinafter "Walker"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's invention as set forth in claim 1 is directed to a game management system for managing various games that utilize . . . a bet board having a plurality of bet areas . . . and that utilizes a chip betted on at least one of the bet areas . . . the game management system comprising at least the combination of: a second detecting device arranged on the bet board for detecting a bet position and bet value of the chip when the chip is betted on the bet area; and a measuring device configured to measure the total weight of all chips located on the bet area, divide the total weight of the chips by the unit weight of one chip, and:

compare the result to information from the second detecting device; . . . wherein the measuring device calculates a number of the chips by dividing the total weight of the chips by the unit weight of one chip, wherein it is determined whether the chip is

forged or not by comparing the calculated number of chips by the measuring device with the result detected by the second detecting device, and wherein it is determined that the chip is forged when the calculated number of chips does not coincide with the result detected by the second detecting device.

This enables the detection of counterfeit chips through a comparison of a measuring device that measures the weight of the chips and calculates a number of chips based on the measured weight and a second detecting device that detects a position and a bet value of the chip on the board. By using these two different mechanisms of detecting a position and amount of a number of chips, two different types of calculations can be compared. If the two calculations do not match, it can be determined that at least one of the chips used is counterfeit.

The Office Action admits that French and Vuong do not disclose or suggest at least a measuring device configured to measure the total weight of all chips located on the bet area. Thus, these references also do not disclose the other features relating to the measuring device such as the measuring device being configured to divide the total weight of the chips by the unit weight of one chip, and compare the result to information from the second detecting device, wherein it is determined that the chip is forged when the calculated number of chips does not coincide with the result detected by the second detecting device.

The Office Action relies on Walker for this feature, citing paragraph 141 of Walker as below:

In other embodiments, the monitoring devices 1610, 1620 comprise sensors embedded in the table that detect information related to the amount of a player's wager. For example, pressure sensors may sense the weight of a player's chips, thereby determining how many chips the player has wagered

Walker does disclose a measuring device configured to measure the total weight of all chips located on the bet area and divide the total weight of the chips by the unit weight of one chip. However, Walker is different than the invention in claim 1, because Walker does not compare the result to information from a second detecting device to determine whether a chip is forged or not. Rather, Walker requires that all chips are not forgeries in order to provide an accurate calculation. Walker provides no method for determining if a chip is forged and therefore no protection against incorrect calculations based on forged chips.

As noted above, the Office Action admits that French and Vuong do not disclose anything regarding a measuring device. Thus, French and Vuong also do not disclose or suggest the combined use of a measuring device with a second detecting device to determine if a chip is forged.

The Office Action asserts that:

French discloses a desire to prevent the use of counterfeit or forged chips at gaming tables (French: col 2, lines 26-27). In other words, forged chips would produce the wrong weight range for the number of chips detected by the RF receivers. Therefore one of ordinary skill would include the teachings of Walker as an additional means for detecting the use of counterfeit chips into the system disclosed by French.

The indicated part of French describes:

In addition to preventing the use of counterfeit chips at the gaming tables and being able to disqualify any stolen chips at the gaming tables, the ability to track and identify each of the gaming chips provide many other advantages.

As pointed out by the Examiner, French teaches the desire of forbidding use of counterfeit chips on the gaming tables or disabling stolen chips.

Then, the Examiner concludes: "In other words, forged chips would produce the wrong weight range for the number of chips detected by the RF receivers. Therefore one of ordinary skill would include the teachings of Walker as an additional means for detecting the use of counterfeit chips into the system disclosed by French."

This conclusion can only be based on hindsight. As noted above, French discloses nothing regarding a measuring device. In contrast, French teaches in the paragraphs preceeding the section cited by the Examiner that electronic circuits within each of the gaming chips provide the security features to prevent the use of counterfeit chips at gaming tables.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Office Action states "These sensors disclosed in Walker would provide an ordinary artisan another security measure to prevent the use of counterfeit or forged chips at gaming tables (French: col 2, lines 26-27); therefore the combination is considered obvious and motivated by the references."

In order for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, at least three criteria must be met. First, there must be an apparent reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the primary reference as proposed by the Examiner. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art references must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

The proposed combination of French, Vuong, and Walker fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Even if the measuring device of Walker were

combined (not admitted) with French, the combination fails to disclose or suggest at least:

wherein it is determined whether the chip is forged or not by comparing the calculated number of the chips by the measuring device with the result detected by the second detecting device, and

wherein it is determined that the chip is forged when the calculated number of the chips does not coincide with the result detected by the second detecting device.

As described above, Walker merely teaches a measuring device with no provision for determining counterfeit chips and French merely describes a desire of forbidding use of counterfeit chips on the gaming tables or disabling stolen chips by using electronic circuits in each chip. However, none of the cited three references disclose or suggest “comparing the calculated number of chips by a measuring device with the result detected by a second detecting device,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, such construction cannot be conceived by combining the three references in any manner and thus is allowable. These features are only found in the recited claims.

For at least the above noted reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. For similar reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 17 is likewise allowable. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-12, which depend from allowable claim 1, are therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reason and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over French in view of Vuong and Walker.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 024016-00074.

Respectfully submitted,



Sheree T. Rowe
Registration Number 59,068

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

STR:vmh